

PROVISIONAL
For participants only

✓ NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/SR.1
7 December 1990

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

FOURTH REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY
ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

MAIN COMMITTEE I

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1st MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 24 August 1990, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

Review of the operation of the Treaty as provided for in its article VIII (3):

Implementation of the provisions of the Treaty relating to
non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, disarmament and international peace
and security:

- (1) Articles I and II and preambular paragraphs 1-3
- (2) Article VI and preambular paragraphs 8-12
- (3) Article VII, with specific reference to the main issues to be
considered in the Committee

Security assurances:

- (1) Resolution 255 (1968) of the United Nations Security Council
- (2) Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon
States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons
- (3) Consideration of proposed agreement on the prohibition of the use or
threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States
Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
(proposal by Nigeria)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des
Nations, Geneva.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE TREATY AS PROVIDED FOR IN ITS ARTICLE VIII (3):

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY RELATING TO
NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE
AND SECURITY:

- (1) ARTICLES I AND II AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 1-3
- (2) ARTICLE VI AND PREAMBULAR PARAGRAPHS 8-12
- (3) ARTICLE VII, WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE MAIN ISSUES TO BE
CONSIDERED IN THE COMMITTEE

SECURITY ASSURANCES:

- (1) RESOLUTION 255 (1968) OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL
- (2) EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS TO ASSURE NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON
STATES AGAINST THE USE OR THREAT OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
- (3) CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE OR
THREAT OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AGAINST NON-NUCLEAR-WEAPON STATES
PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
(proposal by Nigeria)

(agenda item 13) (NPT/CONF.IV/1 and 17)

The CHAIRMAN declared open the first meeting of Main Committee I.

Mr. BOOTHEY (Secretary of Main Committee I) announced that for financial reasons it might not be possible to provide summary records of the meetings of Main Committee I, but the Secretariat would in any case prepare a record of decisions taken.

The CHAIRMAN outlined his proposals for the organization of the Committee's work. The Committee would first hold a general exchange of views on the agenda items referred to it. Next, it would examine in depth the proposals or working papers submitted by delegations. In that connection he suggested that a special sub-committee should be established to examine, under the chairmanship of Mr. Deyanov, of Bulgaria, the proposal by Nigeria (NPT/CONF.IV/17). Thirdly, the Committee would consider the report which it would submit to the Drafting Committee. He asked members if they wished the initial exchange of views to be of a general nature or whether they preferred to deal with the agenda items one by one. His own preference was for the former option.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) also considered it preferable to start with a general discussion of the agenda items. He noted Mr. Boothby's announcement that, for financial reasons, the Committee might have to do without summary records. If it agreed to that, the provisions of rule 42 of the rules of procedure of the Conference would not be observed. He considered that to be unacceptable.

The CHAIRMAN announced that steps had been taken to obtain the necessary funds to finance the Conference. If the financial situation improved it might be possible in the days ahead to return to a normal situation, and thus have summary records. He took the opportunity to remind delegations that the funding of the Conference was not the direct responsibility of the United Nations, which, with its well-known budgetary difficulties, was unable to place its services at the disposal of the Conference on the strength of vague promises of repayment. The Chairman asked the members of the Committee to accept that situation and he asked delegations to be brief, so that the general discussion would not continue beyond Monday, 27 August.

Mr. TALIANI (Italy) said he appreciated that the Conference faced serious financial difficulties, but he thought the Committee could not possibly do without summary records. He therefore proposed that delegations should proceed on the basis that summary records would be produced, in the hope that the necessary funding would be released, which he was confident would happen. He agreed with the Chairman that the general discussion should not extend beyond Monday, 27 August.

The CHAIRMAN, agreeing with Mr. Taliani's proposal, invited delegations not to spend too much time on the question of summary records, otherwise the discussion would become uselessly bogged down.

Mr. GONZALO GUTIERREZ (Peru) also considered that the general discussion should cover all the items on the agenda and that all contributions should be brief and specific. It was his understanding that the President of the Conference intended to convene the Bureau in the near future to discuss the question of the financing of the Conference.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria) said that, as the experience of previous conferences showed, the work of Main Committee I had always been a difficult but instrumental part of the effort to review the implementation of the NPT and to draft a meaningful final document.

He hoped that the Committee would be determined from the outset not to waste valuable resources, but still allow itself enough time to carry out its task thoroughly. He therefore thought that after a brief general discussion

on the implementation of articles I, II and VII and on the issue of security assurances, the Committee should break up into three or four subsidiary bodies which would draft the relevant parts of the Final Document.

In terms of organization, the review of issues relating to articles I, II and VI seemed relatively clear, but the review of article VII and the issue of security assurances might require particular care, given some previous arrangements agreed upon at the third session of the Preparatory Committee. The Chairman had just proposed that a sub-committee be set up to examine in detail the proposal by Nigeria concerning an agreement on negative security assurances, which appeared as sub-item B (3) of agenda item 13. On the completion of its work, it might be appropriate, from the standpoint of economy of time and effort by delegations, to transform the sub-committee into a working group to deal with the other two sub-items (B (1) and (2)), namely resolution 255 (1968) of the United Nations Security Council and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The Working Group could also review article VII of the Treaty.

If delegations so wished, Main Committee I could, therefore, following the general discussion, separate into three working bodies: the first would review articles I and II, the second article VI and the third, formerly the sub-committee, would draft a text for the Final Document on the implementation of article VII and the whole issue of security assurances, making use of the sub-committee's conclusions concerning the proposal by Nigeria. The Bulgarian delegation considered that, while the scope of the consideration of security assurances could be limited to non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the NPT, participation by all nuclear-weapon States, including the two observer States not parties to the Treaty, in the sub-committee's work would be desirable. His delegation was prepared to accept the arrangements suggested by the Chairman for the organization of the work of Main Committee I.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria) said his understanding had been that the sub-committee was to consider Nigeria's proposal in document NPT/CONF.IV/17, but Mr. Deyanov's remarks implied that it would also deal with other issues. Since time was extremely limited, he thought it would be better for the sub-committee not to dissipate its efforts and to focus on the proposal by Nigeria.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had understood the Bulgarian delegation to have suggested that the sub-committee should concentrate on the proposal by Nigeria and then turn into a working group which would deal with the other points mentioned. He believed drafting the Final Document would require many other, mostly informal, working groups to be set up.

Mr. KAREM (Egypt) thought it preferable that the sub-committee's terms of reference should be of a general nature, without specifying a particular document. The proposal by Nigeria was of course very important and should be given top priority, but he pointed out that Egypt too had submitted a working paper, of which a revised version (prepared in consultation with the Nigerian delegation) would shortly be circulated.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland) agreed with the representative of Egypt that the sub-committee's mandate should be to focus on the issue of security assurances, which would obviously involve its considering the highly important proposal by Nigeria.

Mr. HARUM-UR-RASHID (Bangladesh) associated himself with the remarks of the representatives of Egypt and Finland.

The CHAIRMAN, noting the proposals by Egypt, Finland and Bangladesh, said that, in the absence of objection, he would consider that delegations agreed to the proposed organization of the Committee's work.

It was so decided.

Mr. DEYANOV thanked delegations for having elected him to the post of Chairman of the sub-committee and assured the members of Main Committee I that he would do his utmost to deserve their trust, which was an honour for his delegation.

Mr. MACKAY (New Zealand) requested that, in the absence of summary records, the Secretariat should provide delegations with a document reflecting the decisions taken by Main Committee I.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) asked what the situation really was with regard to summary records and whether delegations could share the optimism expressed by the representative of Italy on the matter.

Mr. BOOTHBY (Secretary of Main Committee I) said he agreed that the Secretariat had no authority to take action that was not in accordance with the rules of procedure of the Conference. However, it should be borne in mind

that the Conference did not at present possess sufficient financial resources to provide summary records. The Secretariat had therefore requested that all Committee meetings be tape-recorded, which would mean that summary records could be produced once the necessary funds had been released. He assured all members of the Committee that the Secretariat would spare no effort to carry out its duties under the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN, noting that no delegation wished to open the general discussion, proposed that the meeting should adjourn.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.